Please enter the following amendments and remarks:

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-63 are pending in the Application.

Claims 1-63 have been rejected by the Examiner.

Reconsideration of the present Application is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-11, 13, 16-29, 32, 34, 37-40, 55, 57-58 and 62 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,002). Claims 2-3, 14-15, 35-36, 45-49, 51 and 56 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and in view of Dowling (U.S. Patent No. 6,522,875). Claims 12, 30-31, 33, 41-44, 59-61 and 63 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Lumelsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,672). Claims 50 and 52-53 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Dowling and further in view of Lumelsky. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

A. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1, 4-11, 13, 16-29, 32, 34, 37-40, 55, 57-58 and 62 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,002). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the cited art teach every aspect of the claimed invention. *See, M.P.E.P. §706.02(a).* In other words, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *See, M.P.E.P. §2131 citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 1 recites, in part, "a remotely located knowledge agency having access to information that is responsive to user requests". The present Office Action sets forth element 160 of Figure 3 as this remotely located knowledge agency. Applicant respectfully submits that element 160 is correctly identified as a local database resident within the local memory 106. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that local database 160 is not remote. For example, "when the network connection is *reestablished*, these modifications and changes in the *local* database 160 will be synchronized ...." Col. 7, lines 62-64 [Emphasis added]. Applicant respectfully submits that a local database 160 explicitly does not anticipate the remotely located knowledge agency of Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits at least those portions of the Kim reference cited in this Office Action fail to teach, or suggest, a remotely located knowledge agency.

Wherefore, Applicant respectfully submits the cited reference fails to teach or suggest at least each of the limitations of Claim 1, and hence fails to anticipate it. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of at least this rejection to Claim 1.

With respect to Claims 13, 34, 55 and 58, the present Office Action sets forth the rejection discussed hereinabove with respect to Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 13, 34, 55 and 58 are similarly not obvious over the prior art cited for at least the reasons set forth with respect to Claim 1.

Analogously, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-12, 14-33, 35-44, 56-57 and 59-63 similarly overcome the prior art, at least because of these Claims' ultimate dependence on a patentably distinguishable base, Claim 1, 13, 34, 55 or 58, respectively.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 2-3, 14-15, 35-36, 45-49, 51 and 56 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and in view of Dowling (U.S. Patent No. 6,522,875). Claims 12, 30-31, 33, 41-44, 59-61 and 63 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Lumelsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,672). Claims 50 and 52-53 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Dowling and further in view of Lumelsky. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) recites:

> [a] patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). MPEP 706.02(j).

With respect to Claim 45, the present Office Action sets forth the rejection discussed hereinabove with respect to Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 45 is similarly not obvious over the prior art cited for at least the reasons set forth with respect to Claim 1.

Analogously, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 46-54 similarly overcome the prior art, at least because of these Claims' ultimate dependence on a patentably distinguishable base, Claim 45.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests early and favorable action with regard to the present Application, and a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: August 16, 2004

TODD A. NORTON
Registration No. 48,636
THOMAS J. MCWILLIAMS
Registration No. 44,930
2500 One Liberty Place
1650 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 851-8100

Attorneys for Applicant